

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the courtesy extended to Applicants representative during as telephone call on June 5, 2006. As discussed with the Examiner, the claims have been amended and are believed allowable. Should the claims be deemed allowable, the pending Appeal is hereby withdrawn.

Claims 1-28 are now pending in this Application. Claims 1, 12, 14, and 26-28 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims. In this Amendment, claims 1, 12, 14 and 26-28 have been amended. Applicants believe that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,381,634 to Tello et al. (hereinafter Tello) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,684,634 to Janacek et al. (hereinafter Janacek). Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tello in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,507,866 to Barchi (hereinafter Barchi).

Tello discloses at column 2, lines 41-49 a method using portable e-mail addresses wherein a well-known address is translated to a literal address and returns the corresponding literal address value. This is useful, for example, when a well-known address is desired to be kept even if the ISP has changed. Tello does not disclose or suggest the step of verifying the authenticity of an originator address associated with an outbound message.

Janacek discloses, at column 2, lines 57-64, a method for secure transmission of a message via a network wherein a recipient of the message is not a party to the network or maintains an active address within the network. Message from a network-party sender addressed to an unknown user are deposited in a unique account created for the addresses recipient. Janacek does not disclose or suggest the step of verifying the authenticity of an originator address associated with an outbound message.

Barchi discloses, at column 4, lines 58-63, a method for identifying undesired e-mail messages by storing fields from the header of each received email and analyzing the stored fields for a pattern indicative of the undesired e-mail messages. Barchi does

-16-

not disclose or suggest the step of verifying the authenticity of an originator address associated with an outbound message.

In contrast to Tello, Janacek and Barchi, claim 1 has been amended to include wherein the authenticity of an originator address associated with an outbound message is verified by comparing a mapping of network addresses with account names such that the originator is associated with a valid account name and network address pair. This is described in the specification at page 11, line 25 through page 12, line 10 wherein the authenticity of the originator address of the outbound message is verified to ensure that the outbound message has arrived from an originator computer system and/or username from which it purports to have arrived. This avoids a situation that allows a computer user to specify a fraudulent username as the originator of an email message (i.e., avoids false names in the FROM: field of an email message). By way of the present invention, the verification of the authenticity of an originator address associated with the outbound message prevents email spoofing, since only messages with a "FROM" address that has been verified can be sent. Neither Tello nor Janacek nor Barchi disclose this verification of the authenticity of the originator address associated with an outbound message. Barchi's use of an account and a password does not prevent email spoofing, since it does not verify the authenticity of an originator address associated with an outbound message. In Barchi it is entirely possible that a user could validly login to the system and then send thousands of messages wherein the "FROM" field is spoofed with different addresses to avoid SPAM detection.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the subject matter set forth in the claims of the present application is not anticipated by the arrangement of Tello, Janacek and Barchi.

Since neither Tello nor Janacek nor Barchi, taken alone or in combination, disclose verifying the authenticity of an originator address associated with an outbound message by comparing a mapping of network addresses with account names such that the originator is associated with a valid account name and network address pair, while amended claim 1 recites such, claim 1 is believed allowable over Tello, Janacek and Barchi.

-17-

Claims 12, 14 and 26-28 have been amended in a similar manner and are believed allowable for the same reasons. Claims 2-11, 13 and 15-25 depend from claims 1, 12 or 14 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1 -28 over Tello, Janacek and Barchi is believed to have been overcome.


In view of the above, the Examiner's rejections are believed to have been overcome, placing claims 1-28 in condition for allowance and reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

-18-

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Mail Room and/or the Application Branch is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,



David W. Rouille, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 40,150
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney's Docket No.: ZIP00-01

Dated: June 13, 2006